REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-19, 21-31, and 33-43 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated April 10, 2009, claims 1, 4-19, 21-31, and 33-43 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Rodriguez and SPE Poon for their time in conducting a telephone interview on June 10, 2009. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representatives Jennifer R. Bush and Carlo C. Ocampo discussed with Examiners Rodriguez and Poon the rejection of the claims in view of the cited references. No agreement was reached. However, during the interview, the Examiners were unable to point to a section of any of the cited references that shows detection of a single event in the cited references that causes the "generat[ion] of an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed," as claimed. The arguments discussed during the interview are summarized below.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 13, 15-19, 21-31, and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 in view of Fujita, U.S. Patent No. 5,111,285, and further in view of Lynch, U.S. Patent No. 7,174,151. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch and further

in view of Wendelken, U.S. Patent No. 6,193,658. Claims 6-8, 11, and 33-34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch, and further in view of Ito, U.S. Patent No. 7,151, 613. Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Suiyama, Fujita, Lynch, Ito, and further in view of Merchant, U.S. Patent No. 5,581,366. Claims 10 and 35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch, and further in view Farrell, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,841. Claims 12 and 36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch, and further in view Huberman, U.S. Patent No. 6,115,718. Claims 14 and 37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch, and further in view Najeh, U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Fujita, Lynch, and further in view Patton, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0101343. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites a printer for printing time-based media from a broadcast media feed, the printer comprising:

a broadcast media receiver for receiving and outputting the broadcast media feed of time-based media;

a content-based processing logic coupled to the broadcast media receiver for monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed, the content-based processing logic processing the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event;

a first output device in communication with the content-based processing logic to receive the electronic representation, the first output device producing a corresponding electronic output from the received electronic representation of the broadcast media feed that is distinct from the received electronic representation; and

a second output device in communication with the content-based processing logic to receive the printable representation, the second output device producing a corresponding printed output from the received printable representation of the broadcast media feed.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Sugiyama. Specifically, Sugiyama does not disclose or suggest "a content-based processing logic coupled to the broadcast media receiver for monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed, the content-based processing logic processing the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event." Sugiyama discloses a video printer that receives a video signal from an electronic camera or from a video camera. *See* Sugiyama, col. 3, ll. 11-14. Sugiyama discloses that the video signal can be either displayed on a monitor or an image from the video signal can be printed. *See* Sugiyama, col. 3, ll. 32-34; col. 5, ll. 63-65.

Claim 1 recites that the content-based processing logic "process[es] the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed **responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event**" within the broadcast media feed. During the Interview, the Examiner asserted that the binary representation of the video data signal prior to being processed for display on the monitor could be a corollary to the claimed "electronic representation" and that the binary representation of the video frame of the video signal that corresponds to the printed image could be a corollary to the claimed "printable representation" of the broadcast media feed.

Assuming *arguendo* that Sugiyama's video signal could be considered a broadcast media feed and that the Examiner's assertion with respect to the "electronic representation" and "printable representation" of the broadcast media feed is correct, as discussed during the Interview, Sugiyama discloses that the video signal is displayed on a monitor *when a selector is set in a memorized image display mode. See* Sugiyama, col. 3, ll. 29-32. Additionally,

Sugiyama discloses that the image from the video signal is printed *responsive to a print key being operated* (i.e., pressed). *See* Sugiyama, col. 5, ll. 63-65. Thus, in Sugiyama the generation of the binary representation of the video signal (i.e., the alleged electronic representation) and the generation of the binary representation of the video frame (i.e., the alleged printable representation) are responsive to the occurrence of *two separate events*. In addition, they are responsive to events which are not detected "within the broadcast media feed," as claimed. In contrast, in the claimed invention, the content-based processing logic "process[es] the broadcast media feed to generate an **electronic representation and a printable representation** of the broadcast media feed **responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event**" within the broadcast media feed.

In addition, as noted by the Examiner, Sugiyama does not disclose the claimed "broadcast media feed" nor does Sugiyama disclose or suggest "monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed." Thus, for at least these reasons, Sugiyama does not disclose or suggest the recited limitation.

Fujita does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. The Examiner merely applied Fujita to disclose a broadcast media feed. However, there is no hint, mention, or suggestion in Fujita of "a content-based processing logic coupled to the broadcast media receiver for monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media…, the content-based processing logic processing the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed **responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event**" nor does the Examiner make this assertion.

Lynch does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Fujita. Lynch discloses monitoring for an Emergency Alert System (EAS) code within broadcast audio data that has been encoded with an ancillary code. *See* Lynch, col. 3, ll. 5-11. Responsive to detecting the ancillary code, Lynch discloses that the ancillary code is adjusted by an encoder in order to preserve the detectability of the EAS code in the broadcast audio data. *See* col. 3, ll. 10-15; col. 6, ll. 28-38. Thus, Lynch simply discloses adjusting an ancillary code within broadcast audio data responsive to detecting an occurrence of the ancillary code in the broadcast audio data. However, there is not hint, mention, or suggestion in Lynch of "generat[ing] an **electronic representation** and **a printable representation** of the broadcast media feed **responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event,**" within the broadcast media feed as claimed.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 31 includes similar limitation as those recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references both alone and in combination for at least the reasons discussed above in regards to claim 1.

The obviousness rejection of claims 4-19, 21-30, and 33-43 only applied Sugiyama in view of various combinations of other references including Fujita, Lynch, Wendelken, Ito, Merchant, Farrell, Huberman, and Najeh for the dependent limitations in the claims. Wendelken, Ito, Merchant, Farrell, Huberman, and Najeh do not remedy the deficiencies of the references described above nor does the Examiner make this assertion. Dependent claims

4-19, 21-30, and 33-43 incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims. Applicants submit that claims 4-19, 21-30, and 33-43 are allowable for at least the reasons described above in regard to claims 1 and 31, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-19, 21-31, and 33-43, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: ___June 29, 2009___

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Attorney for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200